

Appl. No. : 10/696481
Filed : October 29, 2003

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant thanks Examiner Lund for the helpful interview conducted on December 28, 2005 with Applicant's representatives, Eli Loots and Sabin Lee.

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None

Identification of Claims Discussed

1, 11 and 20

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent No. 6,132,553 to Ikeda et al.

Proposed Amendments

None.

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

During the interview, all of the rejections in the Office Action mailed October 11, 2005 were discussed.

With respect to the first set of rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, it was noted that the term "mirrored projection" relates to the position of the ribs rather than a finish or polish on the ribs. This is consistent with a definition of "mirrored projection" similar to that of a "mirror image." The Examiner indicated that this meaning should be adequately definite for the present claims. Applicant agreed to point out support for this meaning from the specification in the present Response.

It was agreed that the above-discussed definition of the term "mirrored projection" renders the second set of rejections in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph moot.

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicant pointed out the differences between Applicant's claimed invention and the Ikeda reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,132,553). Applicant's representatives noted that the claimed arrangement was not a mere matter of optimization of known factors and was not suggested by the cited art.

Appl. No. : 10/696481
Filed : October 29, 2003

Results of Interview

Applicant will file a response consistent with the discussion at the interview summarized above.